

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

FILED

-----  
DAVID D. HENWOOD,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNISOURCE WORLDWIDE, INC. and  
GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP.

Defendants.  
-----

Civil Action No.

3:01 CV 996 (AWT)(DFM)

January 5, 2004

2004 JAN -6 AM 11:10

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT  
HARTFORD, CT.

**MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF PAGE LIMITATION**

Pursuant to Rule 7(a)(2) of the Local Civil Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, the Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court's permission to file a memorandum of law in opposition to the Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment that exceeds the standard forty-page limit.


The Plaintiff and his counsel have been working diligently for the last several weeks to complete his summary judgment opposition pleadings before the deadline of January 8, 2004. Because the Defendants move for summary judgment on every count of the Plaintiff's Complaint, and because the Defendants ignore significant amounts of evidence that the Plaintiff maintains must be addressed in determining whether genuine issues of material fact exist that should preclude summary judgment, the Plaintiff's draft opposition memorandum of law, as it now exists, substantially exceeds the Court's standard page limitation. Because of the Defendants' failure to acknowledge the existence of evidence contrary to their position, the Plaintiff's factual background section alone now exceeds twenty-five pages. In revising and editing this memorandum of law over the next few days, the Plaintiff hopes to be able to shorten the brief.

Nonetheless, because of the vast amount of relevant information and arguments that must be presented to the Court, the Plaintiff respectfully requests permission to file an opposition brief of no more than sixty-pages.

Plaintiff's counsel has conferred with Defense counsel about this request, and the Defendants oppose this motion. Nonetheless, the Plaintiff respectfully asserts that an enlargement of the page limitation is necessary in order for the Plaintiff adequately to present his factual and legal arguments to the Court, and in order to assist the Court in adjudicating this motion in the most efficient manner possible.

Therefore, the Plaintiff respectfully requests permission, pursuant to Local Rule 7(a)(2), to submit a brief in opposition to the Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment that will not exceed sixty pages.

THE PLAINTIFF,  
DAVID D. HENWOOD


By   
David M. Cohen, Esq. (ct06047)  
Daniel M. Young (ct17188)  
WOFSEY, ROSEN, KWESKIN &  
KURIANSKY, LLP  
600 Summer Street  
Stamford, CT 06901-1490  
(203) 327-2300

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to the following counsel of record on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of January 2004:

Wendi J. Kemp, Esq.  
Gregory B. Nokes, Esq.  
McCarter & English, LLP  
CityPlace I  
185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

C. Randolph Sullivan, Esq.  
Hunton & Williams  
951 East Byrd Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
(also by facsimile)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel M. Young